



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL for MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIPS GRANT

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001
TITLE II, PART B

2016/17

Application and more information at:

<http://tepd.dpi.wi.gov/programs/esea-title-ii-part-b>

Due on May 20, 2016

These instructions are provided to help prepare a grant application/proposal for the Mathematics and Science Partnerships Program. Specific requirements are provided for key features and proposal requirements. If you have any questions, please call Abdallah Bendada at 608-267-9270.



Division for Academic Excellence

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Tony Evers, PhD, State Superintendent

Table of Contents

Introduction..... 3

Program Description 3

MSP Key Features 4

Proposal Requirements 4

Submission and Review 6

Award Administration 6

Definitions 6

Allowable Expenditures..... 8

Scoring Rubric 9

High Need LEAs 14

APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

For Institutions of Higher Education, School Districts, and Nonprofit Organizations Seeking A MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIPS GRANT

I. Introduction/Background

In January of 2002, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) became law. The Improving Teacher Quality Grant Programs (Title II) are a major component of the NCLB legislation. These programs encourage scientifically based professional development as a means for improving student academic performance. As schools are responsible for improving student learning, it is essential to have highly qualified teachers leading the way.

Title II, Part B of NCLB authorizes the competitive Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) program. The MSP program is intended to increase the academic achievement of students in science and mathematics by enhancing the content knowledge and pedagogical skills of classroom teachers. At the core of this improvement effort are **partnerships between high-need school districts**, including private schools within the boundaries of the high-need district, and **STEM area faculty in institutions of higher education (IHE)**. Private schools within the boundaries of the participating high-needs districts must be offered equitable participation. In addition, other community partners with an interest in supporting improved science and/or mathematics instruction and student achievement are encouraged to participate in the proposal.

The State of Wisconsin has been allotted \$1,936,234. The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) is responsible for awarding these competitive funds along with administering this program. Awards will be made to eligible partnerships based on proposal designs intended to improve science and/or mathematics instruction.

Program Description

- A. Purpose:** The MSP program is a federally funded formula grant to states that supports improved student achievement through enhanced training for teachers. State Educational Agencies (SEAs) are responsible for conducting a competitive grant program and determining awards. Proposals will be from **high-need school districts** partnering with eligible private schools and **STEM area faculty within the IHE's**. Together, partners will create, implement, and evaluate a program designed to improve instruction.

The MSP program seeks to identify strategies that coherently enable, enhance and sustain high quality professional development for teachers. The focus is to increase teacher understanding of content and pedagogy.

The MSP is an impact program. Grants are intended to specifically support program *implementation*. Grants may not be used for the development or planning of a program or curriculum development. Projects must be designed for two years and involve the same participants. No cohort designs will be considered (i.e., one teacher group starting year one, then a different teacher group for year two, etc.).

B. Wisconsin Priority:

K12 Science
K12 Mathematics

The analysis of student achievement data indicates that mathematics and science continue to be areas of low achievement across all grade levels. The MSP proposals must address K12 science and/or K12 mathematics. Grants will be awarded each year for up to two years (down from three due to changes in legal requirements from NCLB to ESSA) depending on funding from the U.S. Department of Education as follows:

- **Year 1: September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017**
- **Year 2: September 1, 2017 through August 31, 2018**

The program will support proposals to:

- **Increase the content knowledge of teachers of science, mathematics and/or integrated science, technology, engineering, mathematics (STEM), emphasizing refined content and pedagogy that provides engaged student learning from K-12.** Proposals will bring together teachers of STEM subjects with STEM subject faculty in institutions of higher education; and provide opportunities for teachers to work with or be mentored by more experienced teachers as well as IHE faculty.
- **Focus on the professional learning of STEM teachers as a career-long process.** Proposals will design advanced professional development for teachers that continues over time. Activities will include summer institutes at least two weeks in length (80 hours) each year combined with additional contact hours of follow-up during the academic year. The focus will relate directly to mathematics and science and enhance the ability of teachers to understand and use the Wisconsin Standards for Mathematics and effective College and Career Readiness Standards in Science.

II. MSP Key Features

- A. Partnerships:** The MSP proposals will be designed, implemented, and evaluated by partnerships whose primary partners consist of high-need school districts, eligible private schools, and STEM faculty in IHE's. Private schools within the boundaries of any high-need school district may participate directly in the program through the school district. Other private schools may participate as a secondary partner. Additional partners might include: other public school districts, public charter schools, businesses, and nonprofit or for-profit organizations concerned with mathematics, science, or STEM education. **The primary partnerships must include a high-need school district and mathematics and science faculty at an IHE. The Principal Investigators, the project director, and the project coordinators must be employed by one of the primary partners at the time of the submission of the**

proposal. The fiscal agent can only be the primary high-need school district or the primary IHE. Partners will engage in the proposed activities at both the institutional and individual levels, and share goals, responsibilities, accountability, and oversight for the proposal. All coursework must be approved by the IHE, and all credits must be awarded by the primary IHE. Teaching staff must be employed by the primary IHE. All participating teachers must be American citizens or hold permanent residency status.

1. Needs Assessment: Staff development activities for the proposal must be based on the results of a comprehensive needs assessment that addresses the content needs of mathematics, science, or STEM teachers. It will identify areas of growth to help teachers more fully understand mathematics and science content, pedagogical knowledge about how students learn mathematics and science, and strategies for instruction that engage students in active learning.

2. Scientifically-Based Research (SBR): The proposal's training for staff development will correlate identified content and pedagogy needs to SBR activities explaining how the proposed staff development is expected to improve student academic achievement and strengthen the quality of mathematics and science instruction.

3. Evaluation: Each partnership proposal will include rigorous, measurable objectives that specifically include improved student academic achievement and an evaluation of the staff development activities. In addition, an Accountability Summary will include documenting evidence of growth toward all objectives, including: teachers' increased understanding of how students learn mathematics and/or science; teachers' increased understanding of the Wisconsin Standards for Mathematics and/or College and Career Readiness Standards in science; and indicators of increased student achievement. The partnership shall submit an evaluation of the project, including an Accountability Summary annually to the U.S. Department of Education Secretary and DPI.

4. Eligible High Need School Districts: To be eligible for a MSP Grant, an applicant must demonstrate a need for improvement in student mathematics or science achievement based on recent data and a recent comprehensive needs assessment of teacher content and pedagogical knowledge. In addition, one of the enumerated requirements listed below must be met. The proposal must also demonstrate that the participating teachers serve a sufficient number of students exhibiting this need.

A high need school district is any district where the mathematics or science proficiency scores do not exceed 65%, based on disaggregated 2014/15 WKCE/Badger Exam results in mathematics and/or science, where there is no currently active Title II, Part B grant in that respective area at the time of application submission, and where one of the following criteria are met:

1. At least 10 percent of the student population is from families with income below the poverty line as identified by the 2014 Census data, or;
2. Schools/districts having Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) or meeting local codes of 6, 7, or 8

5. Project Criteria: Projects must also meet the following criteria:

- If a school or school district is currently involved in a mathematics or science reform initiative other than the MSP, the proposal must clearly articulate how the proposed program will integrate with on-going reform efforts.
- Proposed projects must employ the five components of SBR. **See Definitions* section.
- Projects must have a **well-defined partnership** between school districts, participating private schools, and IHE's that involves each in all aspects of the grant, including the planning, implementation, evaluation, and oversight.

III. Proposal Requirements

Each component (excluding appendices) of the proposal must be double-spaced and the font used must be at least 12-point. Proposals must contain the following sections:

A. General Information: The Assurances and Eligibility cover page must be signed and submitted by an official representative from the Primary IHE or the primary high need LEA. All administrative duties must be performed by the primary partners.

B. 1- Abstract: All applicants must provide a summary that briefly describes the proposal's vision, goals and activities, as well as any key features that will be addressed and the expected benefits of incorporating them. *The abstract may not exceed 1 page.*

2- Repeat Applicants: IHEs or participating school districts that have previously received MSP funding for mathematics or science projects must include an abstract of prior work. The abstract must describe the projects' intended goals, the amount of funding received by project year, the number of teachers it intended to serve (according to its formal proposal), the number of teachers it actually served, a budget summary and explanation of how the budget was spent, qualitative and quantitative evidence of progress towards goals, a description of partnership roles, and an indication of how the proposed work differs from and builds upon prior efforts. *The abstract may not exceed 2 pages.*

C. Program Narrative: The project narrative should contain the following elements and *shall not exceed 20 pages:*

Section 1: Needs Assessment

The project description will document and coherently explain a correlation from the needs assessment to the identified objectives and goals within the proposal. The following items are required to satisfy the needs assessment:

- The identification of specific gaps or weaknesses in teacher and student mathematics or science knowledge and achievement to be addressed by the proposed MSP program.
- Provide convincing evidence that the primary school district has a significant population of students who have historically been under-represented and under-served.

- Include an analysis of objective data to establish a baseline that has guided the proposal's program and instructional activities (attach current student achievement and district performance data).

Section 2: Scientifically-Based Research (SBR)

The project description will discuss and cite the current state of research to support the proposal's project. This *brief literature review* should clearly indicate why the proposed activities were selected and their direct correlation to the needs assessment. If the proposal builds on prior work, the new project proposal will identify the results of prior learning and how those results correlate to the newly proposed activities. The following items are required to satisfy SBR:

- Provide a literature review that defines the project's proposed activities and how these activities correlate to improved pedagogical skills, content knowledge, and student achievement.
- Provide references that employ sound research methods such as (a) experimental design, or (b) quasi-experimental design using demographic alignment of similar schools and/or districts and others.

Section 3: Work Plan

The proposal must clearly describe the objectives and subsequent goals. The proposal will provide a timeline consisting of the type, dates, duration, intensity, grade level, and number of teachers participating in specific professional development activities along with the primary responsibility of each of the partners. The professional development activities should develop the pedagogical content knowledge of teachers increasing their understanding of the Wisconsin Standards in Mathematics or College and Career Readiness Standards in science. The following items are required to satisfy the work plan:

- Describe and correlate specific program activities, addressing the identified needs.
- Define the responsibilities of all partners and their plan to account for all of the objectives and subsequent goals.
- Include the described timeline.
- Include the potential number of students impacted by the proposal.
- Describe how the participants are expected to transfer and demonstrate consistent use of engaged learning activities in the classroom from the proposed content-based professional development activities.
- Explain the correlation of professional development activities with the Wisconsin Standards for Mathematics or College and Career Ready Standards in Science.
- Explain how the proposal's professional development activities are aligned with Wisconsin Educator Standards for Teachers, Chapter PI 34, and the Educator Effectiveness System.
- If any of the primary partners are concurrently participating in the Wisconsin ESEA Title II Improving Teacher Quality Program Grant, describe how the two programs supplement one another if intended for a similar purpose.

Section 4: Commitment and Capacity of Partnership

The project description must clearly demonstrate that the primary school district and the primary institution of higher education submitting the proposal have the capability of project oversight, including managing the project, organizing the work, and meeting deadlines. **All program coordinators, directors, and instructional staff must be employed by the primary partners at the time of submission.** The following items are required to satisfy the commitment and capacity partnership:

- Describe how the program team members will manage the program and meet the deadlines set forth in the proposal.
- Provide a brief description of the programs team processes for meeting identified needs and deadlines.
- Provide a brief description of the programs team decision-making processes.
- Describe the role of each of the partners in this collaborative relationship.
- Explain how the partnership will be sustained beyond the two year grant period.
- Provide a brief description of how the partnership selected/developed the MSP program activities, including the types of organizations involved in the process.

Section 5: Evaluation Plan

Each proposed project should describe an evaluation plan, identifying the research and evaluation methods that will be used and explaining why those methods are appropriate to the issues or questions that the proposal addresses. Note: the creation of a new assessment tool, such as to evaluate growth in teacher pedagogical content knowledge in research-based science instruction, can be part of the evaluation plan. **All projects must have an external evaluator.** This includes the expenses of the evaluator, the cost of assessment instruments, and the expenses associated with the observation visits and data analysis. DPI requires applicants to use at least quasi-experimental designs. The evaluation must be clearly correlated to the results of the needs assessment and describe how the activities will help the MSP Program build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, and usable body of findings. The following items are required to satisfy the evaluation:

- Provide a description that links the external evaluation to the desired teacher and student outcomes.
- Describe a process evaluation plan that provides detailed information on participants that were served as well as service delivery methods to include scope, duration, and other indicators of implementation fidelity.
- Provide an evaluation plan based on an experimental or quasi-experimental design. **See Definitions*
- Provide an evaluation plan that states measurable teacher and student objectives along with annual targets which describe progress toward meeting the objectives and subsequent goals.
- Describe how the activities in the MSP will engage mathematics or science teachers in the content-focused professional learning.
- Describe how the evaluation plan measures student academic achievement using student data assessment.

Section 6: Budget Justification

The budget must clearly be tied to the scope and requirements of the proposed project. The budget narrative will describe the basis for determining allocated monies shown on the project budget page.

All proposals should include provision for evaluation of the activities in budget. The following items are required to satisfy the budget justification:

- Provide details for each budget category.
- Describe how other funds will be used to help support this program.
- Include the budget summary.

Appendix: While reviewers are only expected to read and score the 20-page narrative, the Appendix, which is not counted as part of the 20-page limit, **may** include the following:

- Letters of commitment from the partners;
- Resumes of key faculty and staff (each resume cannot be over 2 pages);
- Elaboration of data (e.g., charts, tables, graphs) used to establish need, or elaboration of research or evidence base used to design this program;
- Evidence of impact from prior professional development efforts.

V. Submission and Review

A. Submission: The MSP Program application materials are located at tepd.dpi.wi.gov/programs/esea-title-ii-part-b. Applicants must submit the full proposal to the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. The signature pages must include original signatures of the primary partners. **Fax and e-mail transmissions are not acceptable.** To be considered for funding, proposals must be submitted electronically to the department by 4:30 p.m. on May 20, 2016 by a representative from the primary partners. Incomplete applications will not be considered. Applications must not exceed 10 MB. Proposals must be submitted electronically at: www2.dpi.wi.gov/msppg/index.action

B. Review Process: Proposals will be reviewed for completeness and compliance with the requirements set forth by the DPI to confirm eligibility. If the proposal is late, incomplete, or does not demonstrate appropriate eligibility, the proposal will be eliminated from the competition. The decision of the department is final. Applicants will be notified in writing if their proposal is eliminated.

An expert review panel will evaluate and score eligible applications in light of the required components and the established criteria. The review panel will make monetary award recommendations to the

DPI. Consideration is based upon the following criteria: final score assigned each proposal by the review panel, a cost-effectiveness ratio determined by the relationship between the number of teachers served and the total cost of the program, and geographic distribution.

Following the review, the DPI staff will contact selected project directors to discuss any modifications of the project plan that may be required. To maximize the effects of limited funds, applicants whose grants are recommended may be requested to revise the project budget and/or scope of work.

Award Administration

A. Notification of the Award: Within thirty days of completion of the review process, the project director and chief financial officer will be notified of the status of their proposal.

B. Award Conditions: For the 2016-17 competition, approximately \$1,936,234 is available for the MSP awards. The intent is to identify and fund a minimum of three projects; however, as many as ten may be awarded.

B. Reporting Requirements: Each eligible partnership receiving a grant must report annually to the DPI by submitting the Annual Performance Report through the USDE APR online system. Further information regarding reporting requirements and forms are available on the MSP website at:

tepd.dpi.wi.gov/programs/esea-title-ii-part-b

D. Participation in State and National Conferences: The coordinators and evaluators of the grant recipients **are required to attend the Fall MSP meeting, the Annual MSP Conference, and one USDE Regional MSP Conference annually. Please, budget accordingly.**

Applications:

- 1- **New Application:** School Districts and IHEs that did not participate in MSP programs during the last five years shall complete a **New Application**.
- 2- **Repeat Application:** School Districts and IHEs that participated in mathematics or science MSP programs during the last five years shall complete the **Repeat Application**.
- 3- **Renewal Application:** All current year **mathematics** projects in their first year of application **are required** to submit a Renewal Application by the due date for this year.

Definitions

The following definitions are based on the definitions included in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

A. Highly Qualified Teacher: A highly qualified teacher meets all of the requirements of PI 34 for the subjects and levels that he/she is teaching. The requirements include, but are not limited to, a bachelor's degree, completion of an approved licensing program, and a rigorous exam in the subjects being taught. In

addition, a highly qualified teacher may be a teacher of record who is enrolled in a state-approved alternative teacher-training program.

B. Professional Development: The term "professional development" means instructional activities that:

1. Are based on SBR and Wisconsin State Standards or College and Career Ready Standards, student academic achievement, and assessment;

2. Improve and increase teachers' knowledge of the academic subjects they teach.

3. Enable teachers to become highly qualified; and

4. Are sustained, intensive, and classroom-focused in order to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom instruction and the teacher's performance in the classroom.

C. Experimental Design: The term experimental design is a research method using the power of statistics to measure the growth of a given variable or treatment of a group compared to a baseline group. The group in an experiment which receives the specified treatment is called the *Treatment Group* or the experimental group. However, the term *Control Group* refers to another group assigned to the experiment, but not for the purpose of being exposed to the treatment. Thus, the performance of the control group usually serves as a baseline against which to measure the effect of the full treatment on the treatment group. All members of each group should be selected randomly.

D. Scientifically-Based Research: The term "scientifically-based research" means research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs and includes research that:

1. Employs **systematic, empirical** methods that draw on observation or experiment and involve rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the stated hypotheses and justify the general conclusions drawn;
2. Relies on **measurements or observational** methods that provide reliable and valid data across evaluators and observers, across multiple measurements and observations, and across studies by the same or different investigators;
3. Is **evaluated using experimental or quasi-experimental** designs in which individuals, entities, programs, or activities are assigned to different conditions, with appropriate controls to evaluate the effects of the condition of interest and with a preference for random-assignment experiments or other designs to the extent that those designs contain within-condition or across-condition controls;
4. Ensures that **experimental studies are presented** in sufficient detail and clarity to allow for replication or, at minimum, to offer the opportunity to build systematically on their findings; and
5. Has been **accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel** of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review.

E. Summer Workshop or Institute: The term "summer workshop or institute" means a workshop or institute, conducted during the summer, that:

1. Is conducted for a period of at least two weeks or 80 contact hours;
2. Includes, as a component, a program that provides direct interaction between teacher participants and faculty; and

3. Provides for follow-up training during the academic year that is conducted in the classroom for a period of not less than three consecutive or nonconsecutive days.

F. Partnership: Partnership means an agreement between two or more high need local educational agencies and the mathematics or science department of the higher education institutions that have agreed to work together in the pursuit of common goals in an attempt to improve K-12 instructional quality and student performance in relative isolation from each other. It is expected that each partner normally contributes resources, exchanges ideas, and assumes responsibilities.

Conditions for success

- Create relationships between institutions, not just between individuals
- Create a bond of trust and demonstrated openness
- Work as a team, for consensus and consultation
- Respect the organizational mission of each partner
- Respect the expectations and limits of each partner
- Share power, risks, and responsibilities
- Invest jointly in resources
- Encourage commitment and permanency from the stakeholders
- Evaluate the impact of the project on each partner regularly

G. Primary Partners: This refers to the primary high-need LEA and the primary IHE. **The primary partners shall not sub-grant any funds to other parties for the purpose of instruction, coordination, administration, or any other activities related to the project. Except for the project evaluation, the primary partners shall not contract with any party for the purpose of instruction, coordination, administration, or any other activities related to the project.**

H. Other Partners: This may include educational organizations, nonprofit organizations, for-profit organizations, education departments, and mathematics or science education departments. It is expected that all partners will contribute to the project by direct involvement, or by providing funds, resources, or services.

I. Official Representatives: The official LEA representative is the superintendent/ designee.

The official IHE representative includes any of the following:

- President/Vice President
- Chancellor/ Vice Chancellor
- Provost
- Research Office
- Grant Office
- Sponsor Office

J. Assurances: The partnership assures that:

- 1) the partners will comply with all assurances associated with the ESEA and EDGAR provisions;
- 2) The partners will follow the protection of human subjects (IRBs), and FERPA policies; and
- 3) the partners will contact private schools within the partnership geographic area to give the opportunity to participate in the program.

Allowable Expenditures

The MSP program funds must be spent **exclusively** on costs associated with providing high quality, content-specific professional learning opportunities to mathematics and science teachers of grades K-12. In general, it is expected that the MSP partnerships will spend approximately \$45 per teacher per/ contact hour on the total cost of their MSP proposed program work (i.e. about \$3900 per program participant per year). The following table provides further specificity to allowable expenses:

Category	Guidelines
Teacher Stipends	The approved rate per 8-hour day during off-contract time; teacher fringe benefits may be covered by the MSP grant funds. All teachers must be U.S. citizens or have a permanent residency in the U.S.
Substitutes	The approved rate per day when the MSP training sessions take place during teacher contract time.
Project Management Team Salaries	Not to exceed 5% of the project director's or 5% of the site coordinators' salaries. The salary of the program coordinators, project director, and site coordinators should not exceed 5% of the grant amount and must be covered by the Administration section.
Fiscal Agent	The administration and the management of the grant is the responsibility of the Fiscal Agent. Fiscal Agents are not allowed to subcontract any duties to a third party.
Sub-grants	Not allowed under the program.
Contracts	Not allowed except for the project evaluation
Indirect Costs	Not to exceed 8% of the total award
Consultants	Not to exceed \$1200 per day. The total funds for consultants not to exceed 5% of the grant amount.
Higher Education Faculty	Replacement salary with no additional money for preparation is allowed
Travel	Reimburse mileage, meals, and lodging according to state/system guidelines for project-related travel.
Carryover	Carryover from one year to another is not allowed under the program. All funds must be expended by the end of each year.
Meeting Events	Reimburse travel expenses for management team participation in ED and DPI-hosted MSP events according to state/system guidelines.
Materials and Supplies	Funds may be spent on materials and supplies to facilitate professional learning of teachers, not on classroom instructional materials.

Additionally, the MSP program funds **cannot** be spent on equipment (e.g., smart boards, computers, printers, camcorders), capital improvements, facility rentals, full salaries of administrative or clerical personnel, and tuition charges and/or university fees already covered in higher education partner's salaries and fringes.

Scoring Rubric for the MSP Abstract and Prior Work

A. All signatures are provided and all forms completed and signed by the official authorized personnel only.

B.1. Abstract: The abstract clearly described the vision, goals, activities, and key features. The goals and activities are aligned with the vision. The Summary Table is complete. It provides enough details about the programs progress towards meeting the objectives and goals.

Weak	Average	Strong
The vision is not clear, or the proposal does not discuss the vision.	The vision was discussed; however, it is not aligned with needs of the project.	The vision is very clear and is fully aligned with the needs of the project.
The goals were not discussed, are not measurable or are not aligned with the vision of the project.	The goals are stated and discussed; however, they are not fully aligned with the vision of the project.	The goals were discussed very well and are fully aligned with the vision.
The activities are not clear or are not aligned with the goals.	The activities were discussed; however, they did not address all goals.	The activities were fully discussed and addressed all goals very well.
The key features are not discussed or are not aligned with the vision.	The key features were discussed; however, they were not fully aligned with the vision of the project.	The key features were discussed very well and are fully aligned with the vision and the activities.
The Summary Table is not clear or the components are not aligned with one another (i.e., the goals, activities, and indicators).	The Summary Table is complete; however, components lack enough information to ensure alignment.	The Summary Table is complete and all components were fully discussed and are fully aligned with one another.

B.2. Prior Work: The proposal clearly describes the objectives and subsequent goals of its funded project. It delineates how the project budget was spent during each year of funding. It includes the number of teachers it intended to serve (as evidenced in the funded proposal) as well as the number it actually served. It effectively described progress towards goals through a thorough description of the work that was performed and evaluated. There is compelling justification provided to explain any unintended results or challenging situations faced by the partnership.

Weak	Average	Strong
Evidence that prior project worked with significantly fewer teachers than intended; or Lacks evidence that prior project worked with intended number of teachers as stated in its funded proposal.	Evidence that prior project worked with as many or nearly as many teachers as it originally intended; or Provides acceptable explanation of why project did not work with intended number of teachers.	Strong evidence that prior project worked with more teachers than intended according to its funded proposal.
Lacks evidence that prior project spent its allotted budget effectively and appropriately.	Evidence that prior project used the majority of its allotted budget; Evidence that budget was spent appropriately on teacher needs.	Evidence that prior project used most or all of its allotted budget; Evidence that budget was spent effectively and appropriately to meet teacher needs.
Lacks evidence that prior project work resulted in gains in teacher content knowledge.	Quantitative and qualitative evidence that prior project work resulted in gains in teacher content knowledge.	Reliable quantitative and qualitative evidence that prior project work resulted in substantial gains in teacher content knowledge.
Lacks evidence that prior project met goals and objectives; or Lacks narrative evidence justifying why prior project did not meet its intended goals and objectives.	Clear evidence that prior project completed proposed work and met goals and objectives; or Provides acceptable justification of why prior project was not able to meet goals and objectives.	Compelling quantitative and qualitative evidence that prior project completed proposed work and met goals and objectives.
Lacks narrative explanation of how prior project intends to use new funding to inform or build upon previous successes	Acceptable description of how prior project generally intends to use new funding to inform or build upon previous	Clear and compelling description of how prior project intends to use new funding to inform or build upon previous successes and lessons

and lessons learned.	successes and lessons learned.	learned.
----------------------	--------------------------------	----------

C.1. Needs Assessment: The needs assessment indicated a clear statement of needs derived from a comprehensive needs assessment and explained how the objectives and subsequent goals of the program are directly related to those needs.

Weak	Average	Strong
The needs assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • did not identify gaps or weaknesses addressed by the program. • provides no evidence the LEA has a large population of students who have historically been under-represented using WISEDASH and WKCE. • provides little or no baseline data and analysis using local assessment, WKCE, and WISEDASH to guide the program. • goals and objectives are not measurable and do not address identified needs. • provides no information how the partnership selected the program developed. 	The needs assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifies some gaps or weaknesses addressed by the program. • provides some evidence the LEA has a large population of students who have historically been under-represented using WISEDASH and WKCE. • provides some baseline data and analysis using local assessment, WKCE, and WISEDASH to guide the program. • goals and objectives are measurable and address some identified needs. • provides some information on how the partnership selected the program developed. 	The needs assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifies very specific gaps or weaknesses addressed by the program. • provides clear and convincing evidence the LEA has a large population of students who have historically been under-represented using WISEDASH and WKCE. • provides clear quantitative baseline data and analysis using local assessment, WKCE, and WISEDash to guide the program. • goals and objectives are specific and measurable and address each need identified. • provides clear information how the partnership selected the program developed.

C.2. Scientifically-Based Research: The literature review discussed and cited the current state of knowledge relevant to the program. The brief literature review clearly indicated why the proposed activities were selected or designed. When the proposal built on prior work, lessons learned were described and an explanation was included about how those lessons were incorporated into the program.

Weak	Average	Strong
The literature reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not support the program. • vaguely states lessons learned from prior work. • does not provide references that employ sound research methods. • does not cite research from peer reviewed journals. 	The literature reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supports some of the proposed activities selected or designed in the program. • states some lessons learned from prior work. • provides references that employ some sound research methods. • cites some accepted research sources from peer reviewed journals. 	The literature reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clearly defines and supports the proposed activities selected or designed in the program. • supports and clearly states lessons learned on prior work. • provides references that employ sound research methods. • cites accepted research sources from peer reviewed journals.

C.3. Work Plan: The proposal clearly described the program activities based on the measurable objectives and goals, and the responsibility of each of the partners. The program description indicated a timeline and an estimated number, type, duration, and intensity of professional development activities. The plan described the integration of all federal, state, and local programs into the current project.

Weak	Average	Strong
<p>The work plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not describe specific program activities that link the goals and objectives stated in the program or the data provided by the needs assessment. • the responsibilities of the partners are not defined and they account for few goals and objectives. • does not define the timelines for the program. • does not describe how activities will increase the number of teachers who participate in the professional development. • does not explain how professional development activities are linked with Wisconsin State Standards or College and Career Ready Standards • does not explain how professional development activities are linked with Wisconsin Educator Standards for Teachers and/or Chapter PI 34. • has other grants such as Wisconsin ESEA Title II Improving Teacher Quality Program in the respective area, but fails to describe the connection 	<p>The work plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides some program activities that link the goals and objectives stated in the program and the data provided by the needs assessment. • describes some responsibilities of the partners and accounts for how some of the goals and objectives in the program will be met. • provides general timelines as to when activities will occur. • describes how the activities will increase the number of teachers who will participate in the professional development. • links the professional development activities with Wisconsin State Standards or College and Career Ready Standards. • links professional development activities with Wisconsin Educator Standards for Teachers and/or Chapter PI 34. • has other grants such as Wisconsin ESEA Title II Improving Teacher Quality Program in the respective area and eludes to the project without details 	<p>The work plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides specific and clear program activities that link the goals and objectives stated in the program and the data provided by the needs assessment. • clearly defines the responsibilities of partners and fully accounts for how all the goals and objectives in the program will be met. • provides definitive timelines as to when activities will occur and their duration. • clearly describes how the activities will increase the number of teachers who will participate in professional development. • clearly aligns professional development activities with Wisconsin State Standards or College and Career Ready Standards. • clearly aligns professional development activities with Wisconsin Educator Standards for Teachers and/or Chapter PI 34. • has other grants such as Wisconsin ESEA Title II Improving Teacher Quality Program in the respective area and describes the connection.

C.4. Commitment and Capacity of Partnership: The program description clearly demonstrated that the submitting partnership has the capability of managing the program, organizing the work, and meeting deadlines.

Weak	Average	Strong
<p>The partnership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not provide information about how the program will be managed. • does not describe a process for meeting critical needs and/or deadlines. • does not describe an explanation for making decisions. • does not describe roles for each partner in the program. • does not explain how the partnership will continue beyond the two year grant. 	<p>The partnership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrates the ability to manage the program. • describes a general process for meeting critical needs and deadlines. • describes a general explanation for making decisions. • describes roles for each partner in the program. • explains in general terms how the partnership will continue beyond the two year grant. 	<p>The partnership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides a management plan outlining the ability to manage the program. • outlines a clear process for meeting identified needs and deadlines. • describes a clear process for making decisions. • describes specific and definitive roles for each partner in the program. • provides a projected plan and timeline for how the program will continue beyond the two year grant funding.

C.5. Evaluation Plan: Each application identified process and outcome research and evaluation methods that the program used and explained why those methods were appropriate to the identified needs of the needs assessment. The proposal made a compelling case for the activities of the program and described how the activities helped the MSP program build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, and usable body of findings. The project has an external evaluator with strong statistical background and experience conducting research-based evaluations.

Weak	Average	Strong
<p>The evaluation plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is not based on the use of scientific methods or comparison groups. • has no measurable objectives or annual targets which describe progress towards meeting the goals and objectives established in response to the identified needs. • does not measure activities and the number and characteristics of teachers participating in professional development. • does not measure student academic achievement or compare with baseline data. • does not have an external evaluator or the external evaluator does not have the statistical background necessary to conduct research-based evaluation. 	<p>The evaluation plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is based on the use of a comparison group of students, schools, or districts utilizing experimental or quasi-experimental design. Description of comparison group(s) is vague or incomplete. • has some measurable objectives and targets which may indicate progress towards meeting the goals and objectives in response to the identified needs. • measures some of the activities and the number and characteristics of teachers participating in professional development. • measures student academic achievement on WKCE in mathematics or science assessments compared to baseline data. • has an external evaluator, however, 	<p>The evaluation plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides an evaluation plan based on an experimental or quasi-experimental design. Description of comparison group(s) construction is thorough and clear. • has clear measurable objectives and annual targets which describe progress toward meeting the goals and objectives in response to the identified needs. • clearly measures all activities and the number and characteristics of teachers participating in professional development. • clearly measures the student academic achievement on local assessment, WKCE, and other mathematics or science assessments compared to baseline data. • has an external evaluator whose

	the evaluator does not the experience necessary to conduct research-based evaluation.	statistical background and experience conducting research-based evaluation are very strong
--	---	--

C.6. Budget Justification: The budget is clearly tied to the scope and requirements of the project. The budget narrative described the basis for determining the monetary allocations shown on the project budget page.

Weak	Average	Strong
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget justification is not provided or does not provide enough detail to justify expenditures. Descriptions are not provided for all budget categories. The budget and budget justification are not directly tied to the work plan outlined in Part C. Does not indicate whether additional funds will be used to help support this program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides adequate justification that the costs of the program are reasonable and meet the program needs. Descriptions are provided for all budget categories. The budget and budget justification are directly tied to the work plan outlined. Includes a description of how other available resources will be used to support the program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides strong justification that costs of the program are reasonable and clearly shows that the budget is sufficient to meet the program needs. Detailed descriptions are provided for all budget categories. The budget and budget justification are directly tied to the work plan and clearly shows how all aspects of the work plan will be supported. Includes a specific description about how all available resources will be leveraged to coordinate services to support and sustain the program.

MSP - High Need Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

**Mathematics
High Need LEAs
FY 2016**

Albany School District	Greenfield School District	Portage Community School District
Algoma School District	Greenwood School District	Potosi School District
Alma Center School District	Gresham School District	Prairie du Chien Area School District
Alma School District	Hayward Community School District	Prentice School District
Almond-Bancroft School District	Herman #22 School District	Randall J1 School District
Altoona School District	Highland School District	Randolph School District
Antigo Unified School District	Hilbert School District	Reedsburg School District
Appleton Area School District	Hillsboro School District	Reedsville School District
Arcadia School District	Hurley School District	Richfield J1 School District
Argyle School District	Hustisford School District	Richland School District
Ashland School District	Independence School District	Richmond School District
Ashwaubenon School District	Iola-Scandinavia School District	Rio Community School District
Athens School District	Iowa-Grant School District	Ripon Area School District
Auburndale School District	Ithaca School District	River Ridge School District
Bangor School District	Janesville School District	River Valley School District
Baraboo School District	Jefferson School District	Riverdale School District
Barneveld School District	Johnson Creek School District	Royall School District
Bayfield School District	Juda School District	Rubicon J6 School District
Beaver Dam Unified School District	Kewaunee School District	Saint Francis School District
Beecher-Dunbar-Pembine School District	Kickapoo Area School District	Salem School District
Belmont Community School District	La Farge School District	Seneca School District
Beloit School District	Lac du Flambeau #1 School District	Seymour Community School District
Beloit Turner School District	Ladysmith School District	Sharon J11 School District
Benton School District	Lake Geneva J1 School District	Shawano School District
Berlin Area School District	Lake Geneva-Genoa City UHS School District	Sheboygan Area School District
Big Foot UHS School District	Lakeland UHS School District	Shell Lake School District
Birchwood School District	Lancaster Community School District	Shiocton School District
Black Hawk School District	Laona School District	Shullsburg School District
Blair-Taylor School District	Linn J4 School District	Silver Lake J1 School District
Bloomer School District	Linn J6 School District	Siren School District
Boscobel Area School District	Little Chute Area School District	Solon Springs School District
Bowler School District	Loyal School District	South Shore School District
Brighton #1 School District	Madison Metropolitan School District	Southern Door County School District
Bristol #1 School District	Manawa School District	Southwestern Wisconsin School District

Brodhead School District	Manitowoc School District	Sparta Area School District
Brown Deer School District	Maple Dale-Indian Hill School District	Spencer School District
Butternut School District	Maple School District	Spring Valley School District
Cambria-Friesland School District	Marinette School District	Stanley-Boyd Area School District
Campbellsport School District	Marion School District	Stevens Point Area Public School District
Cashton School District	Markesan School District	Stockbridge School District
Cassville School District	Marshall School District	Stone Bank School District
Chequamegon School District	Marshfield Unified School District	Stoughton Area School District
Chetek-Weyerhaeuser Area School District	Mauston School District	Stratford School District
Chilton School District	Mayville School District	Sturgeon Bay School District
Clinton Community School District	Mellen School District	Sun Prairie Area School District
Cochrane-Fountain City School District	Melrose-Mindoro School District	Superior School District
Colfax School District	Menasha Joint School District	Suring Public School District
Columbus School District	Menominee Indian School District	Swallow School District
Cornell School District	Mercer School District	Thorp School District
Crandon School District	Merrill Area School District	Three Lakes School District
Cuba City School District	Milton School District	Tigerton School District
Cudahy School District	Mineral Point Unified School District	Tomahawk School District
Cumberland School District	Mishicot School District	Trevor-Wilmot Consolidated School District
D C Everest Area School District	Mondovi School District	Tri-County Area School District
Darlington Community School District	Monroe School District	Turtle Lake School District
De Soto Area School District	Montello School District	Twin Lakes #4 School District
Delavan-Darien School District	Necedah Area School District	Two Rivers Public School District
Dodgeand School District	Neenah Joint School District	Union Grove J1 School District
Dodgeville School District	Nekoosa School District	Verona Area School District
Dover #1 School District	Neosho J3 School District	Viroqua Area School District
Drummond Area School District	New Lisbon School District	Walworth J1 School District
East Troy Community School District	Niagara School District	Washburn School District
Edgar School District	Norris School District	Washington School District
Elcho School District	North Cape School District	Washington-Caldwell School District
Eleva-Strum School District	North Crawford School District	Waterford Graded J1 School District
Elkhorn Area School District	North Lakeland School District	Waterford UHS School District
Elmwood School District	Northland Pines School District	Watertown Unified School District
Erin School District	Northwood School District	Waupaca School District
Fall River School District	Norwalk-Ontario-Wilton School District	Wausaukee School District
Fennimore Community School District	Norway J7 School District	Wautoma Area School District
Flambeau School District	Oconto Unified School District	Wauzeka-Steuben School District
Florence County School District	Omro School District	West Allis-West Milwaukee School District

Fond du Lac School District	Onalaska School District	Westby Area School District
Fontana J8 School District	Osceola School District	Westfield School District
Fort Atkinson School District	Oshkosh Area School District	Weston School District
Galesville-Ettrick-Trempealeau School District	Owen-Withee School District	Weyauwega-Fremont School District
Geneva J4 School District	Pardeeville Area School District	Wheatland J1 School District
Genoa City J2 School District	Paris J1 School District	Whitewater Unified School District
Gibraltar Area School District	Parkview School District	Wild Rose School District
Gillett School District	Pecatonica Area School District	Williams Bay School District
Gilman School District	Pepin Area School District	Wilmot UHS School District
Glendale-River Hills School District	Peshtigo School District	Winter School District
Goodman-Armstrong Creek School District	Phelps School District	Wisconsin Dells School District
Granton Area School District	Phillips School District	Wisconsin Heights School District
Green Bay Area Public School District	Platteville School District	Wisconsin Rapids School District
Green Lake School District	Plymouth Joint School District	Wittenberg-Birnamwood School District
Greendale School District	Port Edwards School District	Wonewoc-Union Center School District

**Science
High Need LEAs
FY 2016**

Abbotsford School District	Frederic School District	Osseo-Fairchild School District
Adams Friend School District	Galesville-Ettrick-Trempealeau School District	Owen-Withee School District
ALBANY School District	Geneva J4 School District	Parkview School District
ALGOMA School District	Genoa City J2 School District	Pecatonica Area School District
Alma School District	Gillett School District	Pepin Area School District
Alma Center School District	Gilman School District	Peshtigo School District
Almond-Bancroft School District	Gilmanton School District	Phillips School District
Altoona School District	Glendale-River Hills School District	Platteville School District
Amery School District	Grafton School District	Plymouth Joint School District
Antigo School District	Grantsburg School District	Portage Community School District
Appleton School District	Green Bay Area Public School District	Potosi School District
Arcadia School District	Greendale School District	Prairie Farm Public School District
Argyle School District	Greenfield School District	Prentice School District
Ashland School District	Gresham School District	Princeton School District
Ashwaubenon School District	Hayward Community School District	Randall J1 School District
Athens School District	Hurley School District	Randolph School District
Auburndale School District	Hustisford School District	Reedsburg School District
Augusta School District	Independence School District	Rhineland School District
Bangor School District	Iowa-Grant School District	Rice Lake Area School District
Baraboo School District	Ithaca School District	Richland School District
Barron School District	Janesville School District	Ripon Area School District
Bayfield School District	Jefferson School District	River Ridge School District
Beaver Dam School District	Johnson Creek School District	River Valley School District
Beecher-Dunbar-Pembine School District	Juda School District	Saint Francis School District
Belleville School District	Kenosha School District	Salem School District
Beloit School District	Kewaunee School District	Seneca School District
Beloit Turner School District	Kickapoo Area School District	Seymour Community School District
Berlin area School District	La Crosse School District	Sharon J11 School District
Black River Falls School District	Lac du Flambeau #1 School District	Shawano School District
Bloomer School District	Ladysmith School District	Sheboygan Area School District
Bonduel School District	Lake Geneva J1 School District	Shell Lake School District
Boscobel School District	Lake Holcombe School District	Shiocton School District
Bowler School District	Laona School District	Shullsburg School District
Boyceville School District	Linn J4 School District	Siren School District
Brighton #1 School District	Linn J6 School District	Solon Springs School District
Brodhead School District	Little Chute Area School District	Sparta Area School District

Brown Deer School District	Madison Metropolitan School District	Spooner Area School District
Bruce School District	Manawa School District	Spring Valley School District
Burlington School District	Manitowoc School District	Stanley-Boyd Area School District
Cadott School District	Maple School District	Stevens Point Area Public School District
Cambria Friesl School District	Maple Dale-Indian Hill School District	Stoughton Area School District
Cameron School District	Marinette School District	Stratford School District
Campbellsport School District	Markesan School District	Sturgeon Bay School District
Cashton School District	Marshall School District	Sun Prairie Area School District
Chilton School District	Marshfield Unified School District	Superior School District
Chippewa Falls Area Unified School District	Mauston School District	Suring Public School District
Clayton School District	Mayville School District	Three Lakes School District
Clinton Community School District	Medford Area Public School District	Tigerton School District
Clintonville School District	Melrose-Mindoro School District	Tomah Area School District
Cochrane-Fountain City School District	Menasha Joint School District	Tomahawk School District
Colby School District School District	Menominee Indian School District	Trevor-Wilmot Consolidated School District School District
Coleman School District School District	Menomonie Area School District	Turtle Lake School District
Columbus School District	Merrill Area School District	Twin Lakes #4 School District
Cornell School District	Milton School District	Two Rivers Public School District
Crandon School District	Milwaukee School District	Union Grove J1 School District
Crivitz School District	Minocqua J1 School District	Unity School District
Cuba City School District	Mondovi School District	Viroqua Area School District
Cudahy School District	Monroe School District	Wabeno Area School District
Cumberland School District	Montello School District	Walworth J1 School District
D C Everest Area School District	Monticello School District	Washburn School District
Darlington Community School District	Necedah Area School District	Waterford Graded J1 School District
De Forest Area School District	Neenah Joint School District	Watertown Unified School District
Dodgeand School District	Neillsville School District	Waupaca School District
Dodgeville School District	Nekoosa School District	Wausau School District
Durand School District	Neosho J3 School District	Wautoma Area School District
East Troy Community School District	New Lisbon School District	Wauzeka-Steuben School District
Eau Claire Area School District	Niagara School District	Webster School District
Edgar School District	Northland Pines School District	West Allis-West Milwaukee School District
Elk Mound Area School District	Northwood School District	Westby Area School District
Elkhart Lake-Glenbeulah School District	Norwalk-Ontario-Wilton School District	Westfield School District
Fall Creek School District	Oconto Falls Public School District	Weyauwega-Fremont School District
Fall River School District	Oconto Unified School District	Wheatland J1 School District
Fennimore Community	Omro School District	Whitehall School District

Flambeau School District	Onalaska School District	Whitewater Unified School District
Florence County School District	Osceola School District	Wonewoc-Union Center School District
Fontana J8 School District	Oshkosh Area School District	Yorkville J2 School District
Fort Atkinson School District		